

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/004,994	JONES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	RAMY M. OSMAN	2457

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) RAMY M. OSMAN. (3) _____.

(2) Lawrence Aaronson (35818). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Garrett.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed particular features of the independent claims (i.e., restricting transmission of packets) that are not clearly anticipated by Garrett. Examiner agreed that although Garrett does teach limiting capacity (¶ 41) it does not encompass restricting transmission of packets. However, Examiner mentioned that "restricting packets" is an obvious variation and that a 103 rejection would then apply to the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.